

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION  
CORPORATION,

Plaintiffs SIPA Liquidation

vs.

BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT  
SECURITIES LLC,

Defendant.

Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (BRL) BANKRUPTCY COURT, SDNY

**OBJECTION TO TRUSTEE'S  
DETERMINATION OF  
CLAIM**

**OBJECTION TO TRUSTEE'S DETERMINATION OF CLAIM**

Jane Delaire Hackett, currently known as Jane M. Delaire (the "Customer") hereby objects to the Notice of Trustee's Determination of Claim (the "Determination Letter") dated June 21, 2010.

**BACKGROUND**

1. On or about June 16, 2009, the Customer filed a customer claim, with supporting documentation, which has been designated as Claim Number 10446 (the "Claim").
2. In this claim, the Customer provided a copy of the Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities ("BLMIS") monthly statement for the period ending November 30, 2008 (the "Final Customer Account Statement").
3. On or about June 21, 2010, the Trustee in this matter (the "Trustee") sent the Customer the Determination Letter, which denied the Claim in its entirety.
4. On September 16, 2009, this Court issued an "Order Scheduling Adjudication of 'Net Equity' Issue" (the "Net Equity Order"). The Net Equity Order provides that "The Trustee and Interested Parties shall reserve all rights, claims and defenses as to any issues and/or arguments not resolved by the Court in connection with the briefing described herein on the Net Equity Issue".
5. On March 1, 2010, this Court issued a decision affirming the Trustee's method for determining the net equity of customer claims, namely "the amount of cash deposited by the customer into his BLMIS customer account less any amounts already withdrawn by him (the 'Net Investment Method')." As such, the Court rejected the "Final Customer Statements" method of calculating "net equity" based upon "the amounts reflected on customers' November 30<sup>th</sup> Statements[.]"

6. By Order dated March 8, 2010, this Court adopted the Trustee's "Net Investment Method" as "the proper interpretation and application of net equity". March 8, 2010 Order (Docket No. 2020) (the "Net Equity Order").

7. A final determination of the definition of "net equity" pursuant to 15 U.S.C. sec. 7811(11) is pending.

### **GROUND FOR OBJECTION**

#### **The Trustee has failed to Comply with the Court's December 23, 2008 Order and has created his own definition of the term "net equity"**

8. As required by this Court's "Order Approving Form and Manner of Publication and Mailing of Notices, Specifying Procedures for Filing, Determination and Adjudication of Claims and Providing Other Relief" (the "Claims Procedures Order"), dated December 23, 2008, the Customer files this Objection to preserve all claims and defenses set forth in the Claim.

9. The Claim was timely filed and executed, and is therefore prima facie valid under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f). *See also* 11 U.S.C. sec 502(a).

10. The Customer contends that the Customer's "net equity" under the Securities Investor Protection Act ("SIPA") is equal to the value of securities and credit balance reflected in the customer's last statement, for all the reasons set forth in the various submissions to the Court, including, but not limited to, the plain language of SIPA and prior case law.

11. The Customer contends that the Trustee has invented his own definition of the term "net equity" without any supporting basis for such definition.

12. The Trustee's Determination Letter provides an Exhibit which purports to calculate monies deposited into the account less monies withdrawn from the account, but the Exhibit fails to provide any supporting documentation substantiating the Exhibit. Furthermore, there is no explanation as to what documentation, if any, was used in order to prepare the Exhibit. As such, no explanation for the denial of the Claim has been provided.

13. The Trustee's Determination Letter fails to meet the basic standard for an objection to a claim. An "objection to a claim should... meet the [pleading] standards of an answer. It should make clear which facts are disputed; it should allege facts necessary to affirmative defenses; and it should describe the theoretical bases of those defenses." Collier on Bankruptcy paragraph 3007.01(3)(15<sup>th</sup> ed.); *In re Enron Corp.*, No. 01-16034, 2003 Bankr. LEXIS 2261, at \* (B.S.D.N.Y. Jan 13, 2003).

**The Trustee Has Violated the Requirement To Honor A Customer's "Legitimate Expectations"**

14. In 1978 Amendments were passed to SIPA in order to protect a customer's "legitimate expectations".

A customer generally expects to receive what he believes is in his account at the time the stockbroker ceases business. But because securities may have been lost, improperly hypothecated, misappropriated, never purchased, or even stolen, it is not always possible. Accordingly, [when this is not possible, customers] will receive cash based on the market value as of the filing date.

H.R. Rep. 95-746 at 21.

15. Securities Investor Protection Corporation's ("SIPC") Series 500 Rules, 17 C.F.R. 300.400, enacted pursuant to SIPA, provide for claims to be classified in accordance with the "legitimate expectations" of a customer based upon the written transaction confirmations provided to the customer by the broker-dealer.

16. The Trustee's position in matters involving Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities is contrary to the 1978 Amendments to SIPA.

Of vital importance here, reasonable and legitimate claimant expectations on the filing date are controlling even where inconsistent with the transactional reality.... [T]his emphasis on reasonable and legitimate claimant expectations frequently yields much greater "customer" protection than would be the case if transactional reality, not claimant expectations, were controlling, as this court's earlier opinion in this liquidation well illustrates.

Br. Of Appellant SIPC, December 27, 2005, *Stafford v. Giddens (In re New Times Secs. Servs., Inc.)*, at 23-24 (2d Cir.).

17. The monthly statements, trade confirmations and all other written account statements, summaries and reports which were regularly sent by BLMIS throughout the entire time period that the Customer held an account at BLMIS created the reasonable and legitimate expectation that all transactions in the writings had been executed as claimed.

18. Based upon the writings such as the monthly statements, trade confirmations, etc., income taxes were paid by the Customer, providing proof that the Customer reasonably believed and legitimately expected that the assets in the account existed.

19. The Trustee's Determination Letter has ignored the reasonable beliefs and legitimate expectations of the Customer, thereby violating the intent behind and the meaning of the SIPA as amended in 1978.

### **The Determination Letter of the Trustee Functions As An Illegal Clawback Action**

20. Pursuant to the Final Customer Statement for the period ending November 30, 2008 the Customer is owed \$857,379.47 by BLMIS.

21. Any and all withdrawals from the account by the Customer were done without notice of any impropriety or fraud by BLMIS and the amount of the withdrawal was deducted from the value of the account.

22. The Determination Letter of the Trustee is in essence a clawback action without an allegation of grounds for the action and without following the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

23. The Trustee's Determination Letter is an attempt to reduce the customer's net equity based upon withdrawals as far back as 1990, well beyond the statute of limitations for such an avoidance action.

24. As such, the Determination Letter is in violation of applicable law and should therefore its arguments should be rejected.

### **The Customer is Entitled to Prejudgment Interest on the Claim**

25. Based upon applicable New York law the Customer is entitled to interest on the Claim. N.Y. C.P.I.R. sec. 5004. The New York statutory rate of prejudgment interest is nine percent.

26. The Customer is similarly entitled to prejudgment interest since BLMIS converted the Customer's funds. *Steinberg v. Sherman*, No. 07-1001, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35786, at \*14-15 (S.D.N.Y. May 2, 2008).

27. In addition, Ponzi scheme victims are entitled to "an expectancy measure of damages, which seeks to put Plaintiffs in the position they would have held had [the broker-dealer] not breached [its] 'bargain' to invest Plaintiffs' money." *Visconsi v. Lehman Bros., Inc.*, 244 Fed. App'x 708, 713 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007) (providing that the funds were placed with broker-dealer for the purpose of investment, expecting the investment to increase in value).

**The Trustee has violated SIPA by delaying payment of the \$500,000 SIPC insurance to which the Customer is entitled**


28. The Trustee has a statutory obligation to “promptly” replace a customer’s securities up to a value of \$500,000 each, as per the value of the November 30, 2009 statements. 15 U.S.C. sec 78fff-2(b). The Trustee has failed to make such prompt payment.

**RELIEF REQUESTED**

29. For the reasons stated above, the Customer’s claim of \$857,379.47 should be allowed in its entirety.

30. For the reasons stated herein, the Court should direct SIPC to issue immediate payment to the Customer in the amount of \$500,000.00, plus interest from the date of the Determination Letter.

31. The Customer reserves the right to revise, supplement, or amend this Objection and any failure to object on a particular ground or grounds shall not be construed as a waiver of right to object on any additional grounds.

  
Jane M. Delaire

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (BRL)

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION  
CORPORATION,

Plaintiffs SIPA Liquidation

vs.

BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT  
SECURITIES LLC,

Defendant.

**OBJECTION TO TRUSTEE'S  
DETERMINATION OF  
CLAIM**

**OBJECTION TO TRUSTEE'S DETERMINATION OF CLAIM**

Jane M. Delaire (the "Customer") hereby objects to the Notice of Trustee's  
Determination of Claim (the "Determination Letter") dated June 21, 2010.

**BACKGROUND**

1. On or about June 16, 2009, the Customer filed a customer claim, with supporting documentation, which has been designated as Claim Number 3198 and Claim Number 10447 (the "Combined Claim").
2. In this claim, the Customer provided a copy of the Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities ("BLMIS") monthly statement for the period ending November 30, 2008 (the "Final Customer Account Statement").
3. On or about June 21, 2010, the Trustee in this matter (the "Trustee") sent the Customer the Determination Letter, which denied the Combined Claim in its entirety.
4. On September 16, 2009, this Court issued an "Order Scheduling Adjudication of 'Net Equity' Issue" (the "Net Equity Order"). The Net Equity Order provides that "The Trustee and Interested Parties shall reserve all rights, claims and defenses as to any issues and/or arguments not resolved by the Court in connection with the briefing described herein on the Net Equity Issue".
5. On March 1, 2010, this Court issued a decision affirming the Trustee's method for determining the net equity of customer claims, namely "the amount of cash deposited by the customer into his BLMIS customer account less any amounts already withdrawn by him (the 'Net Investment Method')." As such, the Court rejected the "Final Customer Statements" method of calculating "net equity" based upon "the amounts reflected on customers' November 30<sup>th</sup> Statements[.]"

6. By Order dated March 8, 2010, this Court adopted the Trustee's "Net Investment Method" as "the proper interpretation and application of net equity". March 8, 2010 Order (Docket No. 2020) (the "Net Equity Order").

7. A final determination of the definition of "net equity" pursuant to 15 U.S.C. sec. 7811(11) is pending.

### **GROUND FOR OBJECTION**

**The Trustee has failed to Comply with the Court's December 23, 2008 Order and has created his own definition of the term "net equity"**

8. As required by this Court's "Order Approving Form and Manner of Publication and Mailing of Notices, Specifying Procedures for Filing, Determination and Adjudication of Claims and Providing Other Relief" (the "Claims Procedures Order"), dated December 23, 2008, the Customer files this Objection to preserve all claims and defenses set forth in the Combined Claim.

9. The Combined Claim was timely filed and executed, and is therefore *prima facie* valid under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f). *See also* 11 U.S.C. sec 502(a).

10. The Customer contends that the Customer's "net equity" under the Securities Investor Protection Act ("SIPA") is equal to the value of securities and credit balance reflected in the customer's last statement, for all the reasons set forth in the various submissions to the Court, including, but not limited to, the plain language of SIPA and prior case law.

11. The Customer contends that the Trustee has invented his own definition of the term "net equity" without any supporting basis for such definition.

12. The Trustee's Determination Letter provides an Exhibit which purports to calculate monies deposited into the account less monies withdrawn from the account, but the Exhibit fails to provide any supporting documentation substantiating the Exhibit. Furthermore, there is no explanation as to what documentation, if any, was used in order to prepare the Exhibit. As such, no explanation for the denial of the Combined Claim has been provided.

13. The Trustee's Determination Letter fails to meet the basic standard for an objection to a claim. An "objection to a claim should... meet the [pleading] standards of an answer. It should make clear which facts are disputed; it should allege facts necessary to affirmative defenses; and it should describe the theoretical bases of those defenses." Collier on Bankruptcy paragraph 3007.01(3)(15<sup>th</sup> ed.); *In re Enron Corp.*, No. 01-16034, 2003 Bankr. LEXIS 2261, at \* (B.S.D.N.Y. Jan 13, 2003).

**The Trustee Has Violated the Requirement To Honor A Customer's "Legitimate Expectations"**

14. In 1978 Amendments were passed to SIPA in order to protect a customer's "legitimate expectations".

A customer generally expects to receive what he believes is in his account at the time the stockbroker ceases business. But because securities may have been lost, improperly hypothecated, misappropriated, never purchased, or even stolen, it is not always possible. Accordingly, [when this is not possible, customers] will receive cash based on the market value as of the filing date.

H.R. Rep. 95-746 at 21.

15. Securities Investor Protection Corporation's ("SIPC") Series 500 Rules, 17 C.F.R. 300.400, enacted pursuant to SIPA, provide for claims to be classified in accordance with the "legitimate expectations" of a customer based upon the written transaction confirmations provided to the customer by the broker-dealer.

16. The Trustee's position in matters involving Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities is contrary to the 1978 Amendments to SIPA.

Of vital importance here, reasonable and legitimate claimant expectations on the filing date are controlling even where inconsistent with the transactional reality.... [T]his emphasis on reasonable and legitimate claimant expectations frequently yields much greater "customer" protection than would be the case if transactional reality, not claimant expectations, were controlling, as this court's earlier opinion in this liquidation well illustrates.

Br. Of Appellant SIPC, December 27, 2005, *Stafford v. Giddens (In re New Times Secs. Servs., Inc.)*, at 23-24 (2d Cir.).

17. The monthly statements, trade confirmations and all other written account statements, summaries and reports which were regularly sent by BLMIS throughout the entire time period that the Customer held an account at BLMIS created the reasonable and legitimate expectation that all transactions in the writings had been executed as claimed.

18. Based upon the writings such as the monthly statements, trade confirmations, etc., income taxes were paid by the Customer, providing proof that the Customer reasonably believed and legitimately expected that the assets in the account existed.

19. The Trustee's Determination Letter has ignored the reasonable beliefs and legitimate expectations of the Customer, thereby violating the intent behind and the meaning of the SIPA as amended in 1978.



### **The Determination Letter of the Trustee Functions As An Illegal Clawback Action**

20. Pursuant to the Final Customer Statement for the period ending November 30, 2008 the Customer is owed \$857,379.47 by BLMIS.

21. Any and all withdrawals from the account by the Customer were done without notice of any impropriety or fraud by BLMIS and the amount of the withdrawal was deducted from the value of the account.

22. The Determination Letter of the Trustee is in essence a clawback action without an allegation of grounds for the action and without following the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

23. The Trustee's Determination Letter is an attempt to reduce the customer's net equity based upon withdrawals as far back as 1990, well beyond the statute of limitations for such an avoidance action.

24. As such, the Determination Letter is in violation of applicable law and should therefore its arguments should be rejected.

### **The Customer is Entitled to Prejudgment Interest on the Combined Claim**

25. Based upon applicable New York law the Customer is entitled to interest on the Combined Claim. N.Y. C.P.I.R. sec. 5004. The New York statutory rate of prejudgment interest is nine percent.

26. The Customer is similarly entitled to prejudgment interest since BLMIS converted the Customer's funds. *Steinberg v. Sherman*, No. 07-1001, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35786, at \*14-15 (S.D.N.Y. May 2, 2008).

27. In addition, Ponzi scheme victims are entitled to "an expectancy measure of damages, which seeks to put Plaintiffs in the position they would have held had [the broker-dealer] not breached [its] 'bargain' to invest Plaintiffs' money." *Visconsi v. Lehman Bros., Inc.*, 244 Fed. App'x 708, 713 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007) (providing that the funds were placed with broker-dealer for the purpose of investment, expecting the investment to increase in value).

**The Trustee has violated SIPA by delaying payment of the \$500,000 SIPC insurance to which the Customer is entitled**

28. The Trustee has a statutory obligation to “promptly” replace a customer’s securities up to a value of \$500,000 each, as per the value of the November 30, 2009 statements. 15 U.S.C. sec 78fff-2(b). The Trustee has failed to make such prompt payment.

**RELIEF REQUESTED**

29. For the reasons stated above, the Customer’s claim of \$857,379.47 should be allowed in its entirety.

30. For the reasons stated herein, the Court should direct SIPC to issue immediate payment to the Customer in the amount of \$500,000.00, plus interest from the date of the Determination Letter.

31. The Customer reserves the right to revise, supplement, or amend this Objection and any failure to object on a particular ground or grounds shall not be construed as a waiver of right to object on any additional grounds.

  
Jane M. Delaire

# FedEx® US Airbill

Express

FedEx  
Tracking  
Number

8735 8310 3363

0200

Form  
10 No.


Emp# 245681 19JUL18 WSHA

## EA SXVA

**FedEx®**  
RKF  
8735 8310 3363

**TUE - 20 JUL A1**  
**PRIORITY OVERNIGHT**  
DSR

**10004**  
NY-US  
**EWB**



From  
Date  
Sender's FedEx  
Account Number

7/19/10

Phone

917-968-6544

Sender's Name  
Address  
City  
State  
ZIP

JANE M. DELANCEY

NEW YORK NY 10011

Company

1445 W. 23rd ST. 10E

Address  
City  
State  
ZIP

Drop/Pickup Location

NEW YORK NY 10011

2 Your Internal Billing Reference

3 To Recipient's Name  
Address  
City  
State  
ZIP

Drop/Pickup Location

1445 W. 23rd ST. 10E

Drop/Pickup Location

Address  
City  
State  
ZIP

Drop/Pickup Location

NEW YORK NY 10004

Drop/Pickup Location



8735 8310 3363

4a Express Package Service

FedEx Priority Overnight

FedEx Standard Overnight

FedEx First Overnight

FedEx 2Day

FedEx 3Day Freight

FedEx Pak

FedEx Envelope

FedEx Tube

FedEx Other

4b Express Freight Service

FedEx 1Day Freight

FedEx 2Day Freight

FedEx 3Day Freight

FedEx Pak

FedEx Envelope

FedEx Tube

FedEx Other

FedEx Other

FedEx Other

5a Signature Required

5b Signature Required

5c Signature Required

5d Signature Required

5e Signature Required

5f Signature Required

5g Signature Required

5h Signature Required

5i Signature Required

5j Signature Required

6 Special Handling and Delivery Signature Options

6a Signature Required

6b Signature Required

6c Signature Required

6d Signature Required

6e Signature Required

6f Signature Required

6g Signature Required

6h Signature Required

6i Signature Required

7 Payment Bill to:

7a Sender

7b Recipient

7c Third Party

7d Credit Card

7e Cash/Check

7f Other

7g Other

7h Other

7i Other

8a Signature Required

8b Signature Required

8c Signature Required

8d Signature Required

8e Signature Required

8f Signature Required

8g Signature Required

8h Signature Required

8i Signature Required

8j Signature Required

9a Signature Required

9b Signature Required

9c Signature Required

9d Signature Required

9e Signature Required

9f Signature Required

9g Signature Required

9h Signature Required

9i Signature Required

9j Signature Required

10a Signature Required

10b Signature Required

10c Signature Required

10d Signature Required

10e Signature Required

10f Signature Required

10g Signature Required

10h Signature Required

10i Signature Required

10j Signature Required

11a Signature Required

11b Signature Required

11c Signature Required

11d Signature Required

11e Signature Required

11f Signature Required

11g Signature Required

11h Signature Required

11i Signature Required

11j Signature Required

12a Signature Required

12b Signature Required

12c Signature Required

12d Signature Required

12e Signature Required

12f Signature Required

12g Signature Required

12h Signature Required

12i Signature Required

12j Signature Required

13a Signature Required

13b Signature Required

13c Signature Required

13d Signature Required

13e Signature Required

13f Signature Required

13g Signature Required

13h Signature Required

13i Signature Required

13j Signature Required

14a Signature Required

14b Signature Required

14c Signature Required

14d Signature Required

14e Signature Required

14f Signature Required

14g Signature Required

14h Signature Required

14i Signature Required

14j Signature Required

15a Signature Required

15b Signature Required

15c Signature Required

15d Signature Required

15e Signature Required

15f Signature Required

15g Signature Required

15h Signature Required

15i Signature Required

15j Signature Required

fedex.com 1.800.GoFedEx 1.800.463.3339